Technology Customer Council Meeting
Minutes of September 16, 2003

F i n a l

Present: Steve Morris, Leon Schwartz, Greg Wright, Joe Finnegan (alternate for Steve Mosena), Keith Greiner (alternate for Gary Nichols), Marvin Van Haaften, Rich Jacobs, Lee Tack

Absent: Steve Mosena, Diane Kolmer, Gary Nichols, Cynthia Eisenhauer, Larry Murphy, Carl Martin

Guests: Nadir Mehta, John Gillispie, Kit Krogmeier, Marianne Mickelson, Lorrie Tritch, Steve Gast (ex-officio), Judy Peters, Denise Sturm, Tom Shepherd, Russ Rozinek, Mark Uhrin, Randy Clemenson, Diane Van Zante

1) Review and Approve Minutes and Bylaws – In the absence of the Chair, Steve Mosena, Steve Morris, Vice Chair, opened the meeting. Steve mentioned that the definition of a quorum had been clarified since the last meeting. Previously, a quorum was considered to be a majority of voting members, however a quorum should actually be two-thirds. For 12 voting members, that means we need 8 to take action.

   There were no corrections to the minutes from the previous meeting. Greg Wright made a motion, seconded by Leon Schwartz, that the minutes be approved. Since there was not a quorum of members present, no vote was taken.

   The administrative rules have been filed, but not yet adopted. We will be making a couple of revisions to the bylaws. This council will recognize designated alternates and the alternate will be able to vote in the absence of the designee. The alternate must be named by the department director and must be approved by the Technology Customer Council itself. Information Technology Enterprise (ITE) staff will ascertain if judicial and legislative council members are considered to be voting members. The updated bylaws will reflect the new definition of quorum as well as language to allow designated alternates. Amended bylaws will be presented for approval at the next meeting.

   Note: During the meeting, a quorum of members was subsequently present and the Vice Chair called for an oral vote to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved as written.

2) Federal Over-Recovery – Mollie Anderson had planned to address the council, but was unable to attend due to scheduling conflicts.

3) Feedback from Small, Medium, and Large Agencies – How should council members obtain feedback from the agencies that they represent? One option is discussing an item at one meeting, but waiting to vote on it until the next meeting so that feedback can be gathered in-between. Until there is some type of repository for minutes, etc., (which is envisioned in the future), the council needs another venue for distribution. Steve Gast

suggested that the draft minutes be forwarded to the CIO Council as well as the Technology Customer Council as soon as they are available.

4) Mainframe Descriptions and Costing Information – Lorrie Tritch and Russ Rozinek. Lorrie distributed handouts that outlined high-level mainframe service offerings and how ITE charges for those services today. ITE is currently conducting market analysis and gathering industry standards. ITE is also looking at billable units so that an apples to apples comparison can be completed. Once the market analysis is completed, ITE may reconfigure a bit. There are additional service offerings that may not be provided in the future, such as microfiche. ITE will be working with the agencies that utilize those services to decide if they are cost effective and should continue to be provided by ITE. ITE also needs the council's input on capacity planning. Lorrie asked if the council wanted to review the information in more detail. Clarification was also provided that all mainframe services will be considered utility (none will be marketplace). Council members asked that ITE give adequate advance notice on any service that might be discontinued in the future. Greg Wright inquired if ITE had included the cost of necessary new technology in the current rates. Judy Peters questioned what level of revenue was generated using these rates, and whether the other data centers (IWD, DOT) would be required to use the same rates? John Gillispie advised that as long as IWD and DOT were only providing mainframe services to their own internal customers, they were only ITE mainframe utility rates. Setting rates is extremely difficult in light of the federal over-recovery problem. As costs are revised, it was suggested that agencies be provided with a notice indicating how a change would impact them. John responded that each agency would also be given options for the level of service it wants as well as each level's associated cost structure.

Steve Morris asked what action was being sought at today's meeting. Lorrie responded that if the council accepted what was presented, the handout would be used as the basis for conducting market analysis and costing. The handout is for informational purposes only. Council members questioned whether this was within the scope of the council's authority. Some agencies do have small mainframe applications. The goal is not to force those agencies to convert applications to ITE's mainframe, but it may make sense to do an analysis of the applications. ITE staff will check with the other customer councils to ascertain how they have defined the word "utility," and will report on that at the next meeting.

Denise Sturm discussed costing in regard to mainframe services. In recent months, ITE has done a complete overhaul of its financial structure. The next step is tracking costs to specific products and services. ITE is also working on a new financial statement structure. Denise believes the council wants good solid data in order to set rates. The most significant challenge before ITE is federal over recovery. ITE is not prepared to give you good cost data until more work has been completed. Denise suggested that the council look carefully at the descriptions for the mainframe services and encouraged council members to contact her with any questions or concerns.

5) Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) – Tom Shepherd – This is ITE's first attempt at defining and describing Public Key Infrastructure. PKI allows the use of digital certificates to perform the following functions:

   a) Authenticate to a legal certainty all parties who engage in electronic transactions
   b) Authorize access to protected systems and data repositories
   c) Verify the author of electronic messages through their digital signature
   d) Encrypt and decrypt the content of electronic communications

   Cost for initial implementation is about $420,000. ITE has been in contract negotiations over the past several months and those contracts are now ready to sign. What we are currently looking at for pricing is $60-$80 per certificate the first year, with a $35 annual renewal. There is a pilot implementation program at the Iowa Veterans' Home. This will become a utility service, therefore pricing will come before this council at some future time.

6) Evaluate Meeting and Next Steps – The next meeting is on October 14 at the Hoover State Office Building.

   Agenda Items for the Next Meeting:
   Redraft of by laws for final approval
   Definition of utility
   Federal over–recovery
   Council approval needed for alternates
   ITE staff to check on voting rights for legislative and judicial members

   A motion was made by Greg Wright, and seconded by Lee Tack, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 3:09.